

1  
2  
3  
4 E FILED ON 7/26/12  
5  
6  
7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
11

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.,  
13

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 KEVIN DUGAN,  
17

18 Defendant.

NO. CR-03-20010-RMW

ORDER DENYING MOTION RE  
ALLEGED FAILURE TO CONSIDER  
REPLY

[Docket No. 424]

19 Defendant Kevin Dugan has filed a *pro se* motion claiming that "a manifest injustice"  
20 has occurred in that neither this court nor the government considered a reply memorandum  
21 that his then attorney Scott Furstman allegedly filed on March 12, 1998 ("March 12, 1998  
22 Reply" or "Reply")<sup>1</sup>. Although the Reply was file-stamped indicating that it was filed on  
23 March 12, 1998, the docket does not show the filing. Defendant does not state what  
24 remedy he seeks for the alleged failure to consider the Reply.

25 The Reply makes two assertions: (1) that the evidence did not support the jury's  
26 finding that defendant possessed more than 1000 marijuana plants; and (2) that 18 U.S.C.

27  
28 <sup>1</sup>The undersigned believes he had a copy of the March 12, 1998 Reply at the time he  
heard defendant's new trial motion but he is not 100% certain.

1 § 922(g)(3), the subject of one of the counts of which defendant was found guilty, is  
2 unconstitutionally vague as to what constitutes an "unlawful user" or "addict." Defendant's  
3 motion is frivolous for a number of reasons. First, the court agreed that the evidence did  
4 not support a finding that the defendant possessed 1000 or more marijuana plants and set  
5 that finding aside (Docket # 311). Second, the issue was raised in Attorney Furstman's  
6 original notice of motion for new trial (Docket # 217); was raised and thoroughly briefed by  
7 Attorney Riordon who defendant hired with respect to the new trial motion (Docket # 281)  
8 and was briefed by Dugan himself after he had discharged his previous attorneys (Docket #  
9 303).

10 The argument in the Reply that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(3) is unconstitutional was fully  
11 addressed in Attorney Riordon's brief and considered and rejected by both this court  
12 (Docket # 311) and the Ninth Circuit (*United States v. Dugan*, 450 Fed. Appx. 633001 (9th  
13 Cir. 2001)).

14 Dugan's motion is denied. The Reply is now in the record as Docket # 424, pages  
15 2-5.

16  
17 Dated: July 26, 2012

18   
19 RONALD M. WHYTE  
20 United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28